



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## AN ANSWER TO MRS. E. G. BRITTON'S LAST ARTICLE "NOTES ON NOMENCLATURE."

JULES CARDOT.

In the last number of the *BRYOLOGIST* 7: May, 1904, my amiable and learned colleague, Mrs. E. G. Britton, deals with me rather roughly for having substituted for *Brachelyma* Sch. the more ancient appellation of *Cryphaeadelphus* C. Müll. "This name, she says, besides being much less desirable than *Brachelyma*, is entirely misleading in its suggestion of relationship, and M. Cardot renders himself particularly liable to ridicule in view of the numerous sarcastic paragraphs published by him on nomenclature in his Revision of the types of Hedwig." That *Cryphaeadelphus* may be "less desirable" than *Brachelyma*, that it may be, besides "entirely misleading in its suggestion of relationship," does not prevent it from being twenty-five years older than *Brachelyma* and consequently to enjoy an absolutely unquestionable right to priority; and I am very much astonished at finding myself contradicted on the point by Mrs. Britton, so stubborn, as a rule, with regard to questions of priority.

I am very sorry for one thing; it is that I have rendered myself "particularly liable to ridicule." In spite of the shame brought upon me, I shall however ask Mrs. Britton to observe that the passages of my Revision of the types of Hedwig and Schwaegrichen, which she maliciously hints at, hoping to make me contradict myself, refer to quite different cases. I have refused and always will refuse to revive, in order to substitute them for appellations that have long been in use, specific names applying to peculiar forms, not widely spread and not representing the type of the species, as is the case with *Barbula humilis* Hedw., and *Hypnum tenax* Hedw.; or names of doubtful species, "species incertae vel male conditae," concerning which it is impossible to agree, such as *Funaria Muehlenbergii* Hedw. fil. and *Orthotrichum coarctatum* Pal. Beauv.; or at last names that have fallen into complete oblivion, and have been superseded by other names usually and generally used for half a century, such as *Leskea adnata* Michx. 1803, known since 1851 to all writers by the names of *Hypnum microcarpum* C. Müll. and of *Raphidostegium microcarpum* Jaeg. Against such names, we can appeal to a fifty years prescription. But such is not the case with *Cryphaeadelphus*, which dates but from 1851 and which I substitute for a more recent name, that has been known for little more than a quarter of a century, and which has been, besides but little used, since even in 1884 Lesquereux and James united *Brachelyma* with *Dichelyma*.

In the same article, Mrs. Britton blames me for having forgotten to remark, in the March number of the *BRYOLOGIST* for 1904, that in the January number Louisiana was included in the range of *Papillaria nigrescens*. If Mrs. Britton is so kind as to take the trouble just to look at the end of my article, she will perceive it is dated November 18, 1903, and Dr. Grout will state to her that he received it some day of the foresaid month. Do what I

would, it was then quite impossible I should point out the complementary note of my learned colleague, since that note was published only two months or so after I had written my article, and I had addressed it to the Editor of the BRYOLOGIST.

At last, Mrs. Britton observes I have wrongfully written *Pilotrichella cymbifolia* (Sulliv.) Ren. & Card., instead of *Pilotrichella cymbifolia* (Sulliv.) Jaegr. Most willingly I confess she is right. I should have looked into Jaeger's work, instead of merely and simply trusting to the article that has inspired mine and where you may read: *Pilotrichella cymbifolia* (Sulliv.) Ren. & Card. Musc. Amer. Sept. 44. 1895. (BRYOLOGIST 6:60). Now that article bears the signature of Mrs. Britton herself! Does not my amiable colleague fear to have rendered herself, in her turn, rather "liable to ridicule" whilst blaming me for a mistake she herself was the first to commit?

Last of all, I shall remark that Mrs. Britton gives wrongfully among the synonyms of *Homalothecium subcapillatum* Sulliv., *Pterogonium ascendens* Schw., and *Platygyrium brachycladon* Kindb. It is not known exactly what Bridel's *Pterigynandrum brachycladon* is. That author quotes as synonym of its species; *Pterogonium decumbens* Schw. Suppl. II. I. 32, Tab. CX, which from the description, the plate and the specimen preserved in Hedwig-Schwaegrichen's Herbarium, is obviously the *Homalothecium subcapillatum* (Hedw.) Sulliv. It is therefore possible Bridel's plant should likewise be related to that species. But certainly such is not the case with *Pterogonium ascendens* Schw. Supp. III. I. 2, Tab. CCXLIII, nor with the *Platygyrium brachycladon* Kindb. Eur. & N. A. Br. 31. Those two names concern one and the same species, with leaves provided with double and very short nerve, which has evidently nothing common with *Homalothecium subcapillatum* and which is, on the contrary, nearly related to *Platygyrium repens*, as I showed in my Revision of the Types of Hedwig and Schwaegrichen, with figures to support it. My opinion, based on the examination of the types of *Pterogonium ascendens* preserved in the collection of those two authors in Boissier Herbarium, has, besides, been admitted, without being discussed ever so little, by Mrs. Britton herself (BRYOLOGIST, 5:II) I do not know upon what reasons she now grounds her change of opinion; it seems to me it would be useful if she should state those reasons in the BRYOLOGIST.

Charleville, May 15, 1904.

---

### HAMMOCK FORMATION.

The following is taken from the Journal of the New York Botanical Garden, Vol. V : August, 1904, p. 162.

The hammocks consist of isolated groups of hardwood trees, shrubs, vines and herbaceous plants in the pinelands. The dense, often almost impenetrable growth excludes the direct sunlight and maintains a high degree of moisture, both conditions being favorable to the development of fungi, hepatics, mosses and ferns, representatives of which occur in great abundance.

JOHN K. SMALL.